Appendix II.

[Vide answer to question No. 433 asked by Mr. G. Rameswara Rao at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 26th August 1925, page 762 supra.]

Statement.

District.		Amount of unexpended witness batta sent to the treasury during the last three years.	Amount claimed by parties.	Amount refunded.	Gain to Government by the new rules.
		RS. A. P.	RS. A. P.	RS. A. P.	RS. A. P.
Ganjam	1922	338 10 7	70 8 0	70 8 0	8 13 0
	1923	276 7 0	45 8 0	45 8 0	5 11 0
	1924	261 8 0	36 0 0	36 0 0	4 9 0
Vizagapatam ..	1922	209 0 0	No information.	75 5 11	10 1 0
	1923	150 11 0	Do.	60 3 0	7 14 0
	1924	98 14 0	Do.	7 0 0	0 14 0
Gōdāvari	1921–22	439 9 0	37 2 0	37 2 0	36 13 0
	1922–23	283 10 0	Nil.	Nil.	15 2 0
	1923–24	335 0 0	Nil.	Nil.	28 4 0
Kistna	1921–22	936 12 6	Nil.	Nil.	Nil.
	1922–23	698 5 8	10 12 0	10 12 0	1 6 0
	1923–24	916 13 0	10 15 0	10 15 0	1 6 0
Guntūr	1921–22	226 8 6	2 12 0	2 12 0	0 6 0
	1922–23	37 3 0	0 8 0	0 8 0	0 1 0
	1923–24	299 14 6	Nil.	Nil.	Nil.
Nellore	1922	65 14 0	29 4 0	29 4 0	5 10 0
	1923	118 4 0	12 8 0	12 8 0	13 14 0
	1924	46 15 0	Nil.	Nil.	4 3 0
District Munsif's Court, Kanigiri.	1921–22	Nil.	Nil.	Nil.	Nil.
	1922–23	5 2 0	Nil.	Nil.	0 11 0
	1923–24	Nil.	Nil.	Nil.	Nil.
Cuddapah	1921–22	44 14 0	Nil.	Nil.	Nil.
	1922–23	18 10 0	Nil.	Nil.	Nil.
	1923–24	33 6 0	Nil.	Nil.	Nil.
Kurncol	1921–22	35 13 0	7 0 0	7 0 0	4 9 0
	1922–23	13 12 0	Nil.	Nil.	1 12 0
	1923–24	76 10 0	1 8 0	1 8 0	9 10 0
Bellary *	1922	86 13 0	Not mentioned.	36 6 0	4 12 0
	1923	63 12 0	Do.	Nil.	Nil.
	1924	19 7 0	Do.	Nil.	Nil.
Anantapur ..	1922	208 14 6	58 15 0	58 15 0	69 11 6
	1923	78 10 0	7 0 0	7 0 0	5 2 0
	1924	64 0 0	9 13 0	9 13 0	4 6 0
Chittoor	1922	51 11 0	Nil.	Nil.	7 0 0
	1923	62 9 0	1 6 0	1 6 0	6 9 0
	1924	96 10 0	Nil.	Nil.	11 10 0
North Arcot ..	1922	151 7 11	17 3 0	17 3 0	2 3 0
	1923	187 10 7	111 12 0	111 12 0	14 0 0
	1924	78 10 0	17 0 0	17 0 0	2 3 0

* Figures for District Court not given. Apparently there are no figures.

Statement—cont.

District.		Amount of unexpended witness batta sent to the treasury during the last three years.	Amount claimed by parties.	Amount refunded.	Gain to Government by the new rules.
		RS. A. P.	RS. A. P.	RS. A. P.	RS. A. P.
Chingleput ..	1922	45 14 0	Nil.	Nil.	2 12 0
	1923	83 10 6	Nil.	Nil.	7 1 0
	1924	189 7 2	3 12 0	3 12 0	11 9 0
South Arcot ..	1922	358 13 0	22 7 0	22 7 0	38 2 0
	1923	425 8 2	24 7 2	24 7 2	49 3 0
	1924	270 12 8	8 9 0	8 9 0	24 6 0
West Tanjore ..	1921-22	633 14 6	19 8 0	19 8 0	2 7 0
	1922-23	828 8 0	32 14 0	22 14 0	4 2 0
	1923-24	721 2 4	43 10 0	43 10 0	5 8 0
East Tanjore ..	1921-22	397 4 11	37 12 0	37 12 0	25 4 0
	1922-23	181 11 0	1 0 0	1 0 0	16 12 0
	1923-24	279 12 5	14 5 7	14 5 7	27 15 0
Trichinopoly * ..	1921-22	402 15 2	18 8 0	18 8 0	2 5 0
	1922-23	506 0 0	21 0 0	21 0 0	2 10 0
	1923-24	482 10 9	35 12 0	35 12 0	4 8 0
Madura (*a*) ..	1921-22	1 2 0(*b*)	Nil.	Nil.	Nil.
	1922-23	3 6 0	Nil.	Nil.	Nil
	1923-24	66 14 0	Nil.	Nil.	Nil.
Ramnad	1921-22	918 6 0	197 8 0	No information. Evidently same as in previous column.	Total gain is given as Rs. 48-12-0 but the amount is not distributed according to years.
	1922-23	418 1 0	76 2 0		
	1923-24	988 5 0	115 14 0		
Tinnevelly ..	1921-22	1,986 11 6	No information.	113 8 0	13 12 0
	1922-23	2,077 2 2	Do.	119 0 0	15 1 0
	1923-24	1,345 1 10	Do.	132 3 2	16 10 0
Salem	1921-22	806 3 0	4 12 0	4 12 0	2 1 0 †
	1922-23	697 2 10	28 0 0	28 0 0	2 1 0 †
	1923-24	612 10 7	14 6 0	14 6 0	2 1 0 †
Coimbatore ..	1922	3,044 7 0	Nothing mentioned.	137 8 11	It is stated that the average annual gain is Rs. 66.
	1923	5,323 0 10		577 7 1	
	1924	5,059 15 5		..	
South Malabar ..	1922	243 0 0	12 0 0	12 0 0	An average of Rs. 6 per year.
	1923	310 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	
	1924	259 0 0	50 0 0	50 0 0	
North Malabar ..	1921-22	149 5 0	20 12 0	20 12 0	17 15 0
	1922-23	104 2 0	Nil.	Nil.	14 1 0
	1923-24	144 9 0	Nil.	Nil.	19 6 0
South Kanara ..	1922	25 10 0	10 0 0	10 0 0	3 6 0
	1923	18 3 9	9 2 0	9 2 0	2 7 0
	1924	26 13 0	7 12 0	7 12 0	3 9 0

* Figures for the District Munsifs' Courts of Ariyalur and Kulittalai not given.

† Average grant per year.

(*a*) Does not include figures for four inferior courts.

(*b*) The reason why the amounts remitted to the treasury were so small is that until recently it was the practice in this district to send unexpended witness batta which was not claimed in time to the parties or pleaders concerned by money order at their cost.